

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,291	01/23/2004	Mathias Franz	2001P08079WOUS	9031
7590 11/27/2007 SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT.			EXAMINER	
			SMITH, CREIGHTON H	
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1011111, 113 00	3030		2614	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
•					
تست	Office Action Summary	10/764,291	FRANZ ET AL.		
	Onice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Creighton H. Smith	2614		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports.	oears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DISTRICT OF THE MAILIN	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status	·				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice under b	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document copies of the priority document copies of the priority document copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been recei u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage		
Attachmer	nt(s)		•		
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa			
3) 🔯 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 23.01.04	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:			

Application/Control Number:

10/764,291 Art Unit: 2614

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Examiner does not understand how applicant's dialog/announcement devices, which are both "within a telecommunications network," can be "centrally" and also "non-centrally located." It only seems to hold that if both of these devices are "within a telecommunications network" then both devices must both be either centrally or non-centrally located. Also, it is not clear what the metes and bounds are to be "centrally" and "non-centrally" located, especially since both devices are located within the network. This renders the claims vague and indefinite. Also, the terms "centrally" and "non-centrally" are relative terms. What's central? What's non-central?

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Creighton H.

Smith at telephone number 571/272-7546.

14 NOV '07

Creighton H Smith Primary Examiner Art Unit 2614